



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-0450
www.uspto.gov

WY

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/955,879	09/19/2001	Kelyn Anne Aroca	R293R	1449
27752	7590	06/02/2004		EXAMINER
THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY			TORRES VELAZQUEZ, NORCA LIZ	
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION				
WINTON HILL TECHNICAL CENTER - BOX 161			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
6110 CENTER HILL AVENUE			1771	
CINCINNATI, OH 45224				

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/955,879	ARORA ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Norca L. Torres-Velazquez	1771

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 February 2004.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-27 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 13-27 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-12 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on February 23, 2004 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5 and 7-11 over Kirby et al. in view of Brock et al. have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

a. Applicants assert that it is known in the art to achieve soft webs as described in Kirby et al. and that it is known to achieve higher strength and abrasion resistance webs as described in Brock et al. However, the references do not disclose or teach how to achieve all three characteristics of softness, strength, and abrasion resistance in a nonwoven web.

Applicant's arguments are noted and a new art is applied below that addresses the newly added limitation that requires the nonwoven to be stretched. Kirby et al. and Brock et al. fail to teach this particular limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(c) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5 and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over MEECE et al. (US 2001/0008675 A1).

MEECE et al. discloses a nonwoven web of multipolymer fibers for use in disposable absorbent articles. [0001] The reference teaches that the multipolymer fibers can be formed from immiscible polymers that include polyethylene and polypropylene. [0017] Further, it teaches that the multipolymer fibers may comprise from 1 to 50 percent by weight polyethylene and from 99 to 50 percent by weight polypropylene. Fabrics formed from such blends exhibit

low fuzz and good elongation. [0051] In Figure 1, the reference shows a web that has been bonded and intermittent point bond regions 22 are formed wherein the web is bonded. The fused regions cover preferably between 6 and 30 percent of the area of the web. The reference teaches the use of thermal bonding. [0060] MEECE et al. teaches the use of incremental mechanical stretching of the web. [0016] The reference further teaches that the extensible nonwoven web, in all embodiments of their invention, is characterized by having high surface abrasion resistance and high elongation. [0059] With regards to the basis weight of the nonwoven web, Examples 1 and 2 of Table 1 of the reference show average values of 62.07 and 64.61 gsm for the webs.

It is the Examiner's interpretation of the MEECE et al. discloses all the elements of applicant's claim 1. Although MEECE et al. does not explicitly teach the claimed fuzz removal value and the bending rigidity, it is reasonable to presume that said properties are inherent to MEECE et al. Support for said presumption is found in the use of like materials (i.e. nonwoven web with a basis weight of about 60 gsm, made of multicomponent fibers of polyethylene and polypropylene, and a consolidation area between 6-30 percent and the nonwoven web is stretched by an incremental stretching procedure). The burden is upon Applicant to prove otherwise. *In re Fitzgerald* 205 USPQ 594. In addition, the presently claimed property of a fuzz removal value of less than about 0.30 mg/cm² and a bending rigidity of less than about 0.018 g.cm²/cm would obviously have been present one the MEECE et al. product is provided. Note *In re Best*, 195 USPQ at 433, footnote 4 (CCPA 1977) as to the providing of this rejection made above under 35 USC 102.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Norca L. Torres-Velazquez whose telephone number is 571-272-1484. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8:00-4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached on 571-272-1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

NL
Norca L. Torres-Velazquez
Examiner
Art Unit 1771

May 21, 2004

Elizabeth Cole
ELIZABETH M. COLE
PRIMARY EXAMINER